REMARKS

In the Office Action, claims 1-50 were rejected. By the present Response, claims 1, 6, 24, 26, 31, and 49 are amended. Upon entry of the amendments, claims 1-50 will remain pending in the present patent application. No new matter has been added. All claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 9, 14, 24, 34, 39, and 49 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The Examiner rejected claims 9, 14, 34, and 39 because they recite "hypertext transfer protocol server." The Examiner stated that this rendered the claims indefinite and that "hypertext transfer protocol server" would be interpreted as a web application server (*e.g.*, a web server that provides access to the web page).

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and do not believe that "hypertext transfer protocol server" renders the claim indefinite. Applicants direct the Examiner to the following passage in the specification:

> In general operation, the client computer system requests a web page by issuing a URL request through the network to the server system 102. A URL consistent with the present invention may be a simple URL of the form: <protocol_identifier>://<server_path>/<web_page_- path> The protocol identifier http specifies the conventional hypertext transfer protocol, however other suitable protocol identifiers may be implemented. For example, a URL request for a secure network communication session typically utilizes the secure protocol identifier https, assuming that the client browser and web server each support and implement the secure sockets layer (SSL). The server_path is typically of the form

> prefix.domain, where the prefix may be www to designate a web server and the domain is the standard network sub-domain.top-level-domain of the server system 106. The optional web_page_path is provided to specifically identify a particular hyper-text page maintained by the asset management server computer system 102.
>
> Application, paragraph 39.

This passage provides a basis for interpreting "hypertext protocol server computer system" as one that provides an optional web_page_path to specifically identify a particular hyper-text page maintained by the asset management server computer system. Additionally, claims 9, 14, 34, and 39 currently recite a "web server computer system" to which the "hypertext transfer protocol server computer system" operatively connects. Thus, neither the specification nor the claims support the interpretation provided by the Examiner. Moreover, the claim terms are believed to be sufficiently clear to satisfy the statutory requirements. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

The Examiner rejected claim 24 and 49 because the recite "synchronizing local asset management information with asset management information." The Examiner stated that this rendered the claims indefinite and that "synchronizing local asset management information with asset management information" would be interpreted as writing and updating information on the server based on information received from the remote computer.

Applicants have amended claims 24 and 49 to include "synchronizing local information with asset management information." This amendments find support in the specification in a number of places. For example, the specification sets forth:

> Relating specifically to the synchronize option, administrative level users are provided with the authority to synchronize asset management information between the website and a remote client computer system in

> the manner set forth in detail above. In particular, by selecting the synchronize option from the main menu page 416, a synchronize select form 418 is displayed, wherein information regarding the information to be synchronized is submitted. This information should include at least a local file location for the XML file discussed above which is then uploaded to the website. Next, upon submission of a completed form 418, an electronic mail message 420 is generated which confirms the synchronization process.
>
> Application, paragraph 59.

Applicants note that synchronizing local information with information received from the asset manager server is not consistent with the Examiners interpretation and respectfully disagree with it. However, Applicants believe that the amended claim is not indefinite and that the Examiner's interpretation is no longer relevant. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-6, 16-17, 20, 24, 26-31, 41-42, 45, and 49 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Marsh et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0023517 (hereinafter "Marsh"). Applicants note that, of these claims, claims 1 and 26 are independent. Applicants also note that each of these independent claims has been amended. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and believe that Marsh cannot support a *prima facie* case of anticipation of at least these independent claims.

Independent claims 1 and 26 recite, *inter alia,* a remote client computer system (*e.g., 104)* that is separate from the interrogation device (*e.g.,* 106) and that operatively connects to the asset management server computer system (*e.g.,* 102). *See, e.g.,* FIG. 1. Additionally, the claims recite that the asset management server maintains at least one database. Thus, the recited elements in the claim include, at least, a remote client

computer system, an interrogation device, an asset management server computer system, and at least one database.

Marsh fails to disclose all of these claimed elements. Even if, *arguendo*, Marsh discloses components analogous to a data server 130 and an interrogation device 110 (*see, e.g.,* Marsh, FIGs. 1-2), Marsh *clearly fails to disclose a remote client computer system* and does not explicitly disclose an asset management server. Therefore, Marsh cannot support a *prima facie* case of anticipation because it fails to disclose all of the claimed elements. Thus, Applicants traverse the rejection of independent claims 1 and 26, and the claims depending therefrom, and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

As discussed above, Applicants believe the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of anticipation of independent claims 1 and 26. Additionally, claims 2-25 depend directly or indirectly from claim 1 and claims 27-50 depend directly or indirectly from claim 26. The Examiner rejected dependent claims 2-25 and 27-50 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) using Marsh as the primary reference. As discussed above, Applicants believe that Marsh fails to disclose all of the claimed elements of the independent claims. Further, Applicants have carefully reviewed the cited art and believe that considered by themselves, or in connection with Marsh, none of them cure the deficiencies of Marsh. The Examiner did not advance any argument to the contrary. Therefore, Applicants traverse the rejection of dependent claims 2-25 and 27-50, based at least upon their dependency on an allowable independent claims 1 and 26.

In addition, in some of the foregoing rejections, the Examiner argued that several unique features of the present claims are allegedly "well known in the art." Specifically, in the rejection of claims 7 and 32, the Examiner stated that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include connecting a server computer system to a

legacy database. *See* Office Action page 9. Applicants seasonably traverse the Examiner's use of Official Notice and maintain that the pending claims are patentable over the cited reference taken alone or in combination with any other art. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner cite to specific references, passages, or figures to support the contention that certain elements are allegedly suggested by the references and, also, to provide support under M.P.E.P. § 2144.03 for the explicit and apparent assertions that certain elements are "well known in the art."

Conclusion

In view of the remarks and amendments set forth above, Applicants respectfully request allowance of the pending claims. If the Examiner believes that a telephonic interview will help speed this application toward issuance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 1/29/2007

Patrick S. Yoder
Reg. No. 37,479
FLETCHER YODER
P.O. Box 692289
Houston, TX 77269-2289
(281) 970-4545